

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

Richard Duncan,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Case No. 2:20–cv–2295
Judge Michael H. Watson
Magistrate Judge Vascura**

Frank LaRose, et al.,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Richard Duncan (“Plaintiff”) sues Secretary of State Frank LaRose, Governor Mike Dewine, and the Ohio General Assembly (collectively “Defendants”). Compl., ECF No. 1. One week after Plaintiff sued, he moved for “an emergency preliminary injunction.” Mot., ECF No. 5. Plaintiff’s motion states that “[t]he basis for this is set forth in the allegations of [the] Complaint and in his Exhibit A Declaration attached thereto.” *Id.*

Plaintiff’s motion is deficient under this Court’s Local Rules and does not warrant review without more. Specifically, Local Rule 7.2(a)(1) requires all motions to “be accompanied by a memorandum in support thereof that shall be a brief statement of the grounds, with citation of authorities relied upon.” Plaintiff’s Complaint raises serious allegations, including that Defendants have violated his constitutional rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The relief Plaintiff seeks is equally serious, including a declaration that various election laws are unconstitutional and a restraining order

against Defendants from enforcing those election laws. The Court will not act as Plaintiff's attorney and will not consider granting relief in this case in the absence of argument from Plaintiff, including citation to relevant authority, that he is entitled to such extraordinary relief. See *Lyon v. Yellow Transp., Inc.*, No. 2:08-cv-464, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS **17–18 (S.D. Ohio June 8, 2009) (“a noncompliant, unsupported motion warrants denial”) (collecting cases).

For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion for emergency injunctive relief, ECF No. 5, is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Michael H. Watson

MICHAEL H. WATSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT